REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-12 are amended.

In section 3 on pages 2-4, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takemoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,742) (hereinafter "Takemoto"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takemoto does not disclose each and every feature of the invention as recited in claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, and 12.

Regarding claims 1, 2 and 5 the invention recited is different from Takemoto in both configuration and effects.

One of the main characteristics of the invention in claims 1, 2 and 5 is that one can understand the content of the file by looking at its name, or, if the file is an image file, by looking at the image. Specifically, in the invention as recited in claims 1, 2 and 5, file names are automatically generated when an obtained image is stored in the memory. This automatic generation is done based on the information relating to the obtained image, and done according to set generating rules, which are decided beforehand. The generating rules for generating file names are configured so that users can arbitrarily define the rules beforehand.

Takemoto discloses an apparatus which has software for having users make an input to choose or generate folders for storing image files generated by a digital camera 20 (shown in Fig. 1), so that the users can easily manage the image files. Takemoto discloses attaching information to images sent from the digital camera 20.

However, Takemoto does not disclose an apparatus where the contents of the image files can be understood from file names, or an apparatus where the file names are automatically generated. Takemoto does not even mention naming files in any context. Takemoto only discloses attaching information concerning the contents of the images by the

manual procedure shown in Figs. 2-4. The attached information does not contribute to naming files in Takemoto, but is only recorded in the retrieving table 17B as additional information.

In the present invention as recited in claims 1, 2 and 5, file names are automatically generated when an obtained image is stored in the memory. This automatic generation is done based on the information relating to the obtained image, and done according to set generating rules, decided beforehand by the users. The users need not go through the extra labor of naming files, because the files are named automatically. Moreover, users can easily guess what the contents of the images are, because the file names themselves reflect information concerning the contents of the images. The invention recited in claims 1, 2 and 5 also has the advantageous effect of being able to manage files easily, because the image files are stored in the memory using the automatically generated file names.

Amendments have been made in claims 1, 2 and 5, to clarify the above-described differences between those claims and Takemoto. The term "structure information" reads on "generating rules" for file names as explained above.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of features as recited in claims 1, 2 and 5 is completely different from the disclosure of Takemoto, and that Takemoto clearly does not anticipate claims 1, 2 and 5.

Claim 6 is also completely different from Takemoto. In claim 6, virtual file names are automatically generated when an obtained image is stored in the memory. This automatic generation is done based on the information relating to the obtained image, and done according to set generating rules decided beforehand by the users. The virtual file name is generated in addition to, and independent from, the file name of the image file itself. The users can arbitrarily define the rules for generating file names beforehand, and the obtained images are managed according to the virtual file names.

Therefore, claim 6 has the same differences in configuration and effect as previously described in connection with claims 1, 2 and 5 when compared to Takemoto. Therefore, claim 6 is also not anticipated by Takemoto. The differences are clarified by the amendments to claim 6.

Claims 7, 8, 11, and 12 are computer program claims corresponding to claims 1, 2, 5 and 6. Thus, the distinctions previously described between claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 and Takemoto also apply to claims 7, 8, 11 and 12.

Similarly, the amendments to claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 are made to clarify those differences, as was done with claims 1, 2, 5 and 6.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 12 as being anticipated by Takemoto should be withdrawn.

In section 5 on page 5, the Office Action rejects claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takemoto in view of Higashiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,272) (hereinafter "Higashiyama"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 is not obvious over Takemoto and Higashiyama because the combination of features recited in claim 3 is completely different from both Takemoto and Higashiyama.

First of all, claim 3 is different from Takemoto for reasons similar to those described above in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5. Secondly, Higashiyama, along with Takemoto, also does not have the user arbitrarily set how the file names are to be configured, and does not automatically generate file names as recited in claim 3. This also means that users cannot guess what the contents of the image files are in Higashiyama, whereas users of the invention recited in claim 3 can. Higashiyama only implies that there can be a part in the file name of each of an image file and an audio file that are in common, for example, when the image file and the audio file are of the same object. This is stated in col. 6, lines 3-12 in Higashiyama.

Further, because claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, claim 3 is allowable based on that dependence.

Therefore, the invention of claim 3 is not obvious over the combination of Takemoto and Higashiyama.

Claim 9 is a computer program claim corresponding to claim 3. Thus, claim 9 is allowable for reasons similar to the reasons previously stated in connection with claim 3.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takemoto in view of Higashiyama should be withdrawn.

In section 6 on pages 6-7, the Office Action rejects claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takemoto in view of Hatanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,320) (hereinafter "Hatanaka"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 is allowable based on its dependence from claim 1 for the reasons previously stated in connection with claim 1.

Claim 10 is a computer program claim corresponding to claim 4. Thus, claim 10 is allowable for reasons similar to those previously stated in connection with claim 4.

Moreover, since claim 10 is dependent on claim 7, it is also allowable based at least on that dependency.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takemoto in view of Hatanaka should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Woodall

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

MAC:MRW/cfr

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 6, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461